

REMARKS

All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,084,583) in view of Cho et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,834,048). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the basis that Cho et al. is not properly cited prior art.

All claims also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Gerszberg et al. in view of Pardo (U.S. Patent No. 6,266,539). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the basis that Pardo simply does not disclose, teach or suggest in any way the features that it is cited as disclosing.

First, it should be noted that the present application was filed on July 12, 2001, but that the benefit of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/217,800, filed July 12, 2000 is claimed. Cho et al. issued on December 21, 2004, and was filed on September 22, 2000, with no earlier benefit being claimed. Thus, assuming that the claims of the present application are supported by the disclosure of U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/217,800, Cho et al. is not prior art to the present application based on date.

In this regard, Applicant believes that Claim 1 is representative of all independent claims. As such, Applicant below maps support in U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/217,800 for all elements of Claim 1:

1. A system for displaying a web content on a display of a user computer, said system comprising: **(Summary of the Invention, lines 1-2; Claim 1, lines 3-4; Claim 3)**

a central computer; **(Claim 1, line 2; Claim 2)**

software executing on said central computer for receiving a request to transmit a web page; **(Claim 1, line 2; Claim 2; Claim 3)**

software executing on said central computer for transmitting a web page to the user computer in response to the request to transmit a web page, the web page comprising attract loop code, wherein the attract loop code monitors the user computer for a user event, and only if the user event does not occur within a specified time period, the attract loop code automatically transmits a request for attract loop content to said central computer; **(Summary of the Invention, lines 2-4; Claim 1, lines 2-5; Claim 2; Claim 3)**

software executing on said central computer for automatically transmitting attract loop content to the user computer in response to the request for attract loop content; and **(Summary of the Invention, lines 2-4)**

wherein the attract loop code causes the attract loop content to be displayed on the display of the user computer. **(Summary of the Invention, lines 2-4; Claim 4; Claim 5)**

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention of Claim 1 is fully supported by U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/217,800, which pre-dates the filing of Cho et al. As such, Cho et al. is not a properly cited reference.

The Examiner disagrees, stating that in the Summary of the Invention section of the Provisional Application, Applicant recites the detection of an “idle” period of predetermined duration and automatic display of a web attract loop upon such detection. The Examiner then goes on to assert that although one dictionary definition of “idle” is inactive, another definition of the word per www.dictionary.com is slow. Thus, the Examiner concludes, Claim 1, which requires inactivity, is not supported by the Provisional Application.

Applicant respectfully disagrees for at least three reasons.

First, while the Summary of the Invention section of the Provisional Application does indeed disclose detection of an “idle” period, Claim 1 of the Provisional Application (which also forms part of the Specification thereof) specifically discloses that what is being monitored is a period of “no activity”. Thus, even if the portion of the Provisional Application cited by the Examiner does not support Claim 1 of the present application (a conclusion with which Applicant disagrees for the reasons set forth below), the limitation in question of Claim 1 of the present application is explicitly supported just several lines below.

Second, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s assertion that one skilled in the art would interpret the term “idle period” in the Provisional

Application to mean anything other than a period of inactivity. While Applicant acknowledges that one of the definitions for the word “idle” found on www.dictionary.com is “[t]o run at a slow speed or out of gear” (indeed, this is the only definition Applicant could find having to do with something idle being “slow”), this definition specifically has to do with motors and motor vehicles (“Used of a motor vehicle”). As the present application has nothing to do with motors or motor vehicles, Applicant respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would clearly not impart this “slow” definition to the term “idle period” found in the Provisional Patent Application. Rather, one skilled in the art would clearly understand the term “idle period” to mean a period of inactivity, particularly since Claim 1 of the Provisional Patent Application explicitly used the terms “if there is no activity” and “that there is no activity.”

Third, it appears that the Examiner is asserting that the term “idle period” can mean either a period of no activity or a period of slow activity. While Applicant does not agree with this assertion (as discussed above), even if it were true, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 of the present application would still be fully supported by the Provisional Patent Application. If the Provisional Patent Application supports a system that monitors for a period of no activity and/or a period of slow activity, and Claim 1 of the present application requires monitoring for a period of no activity, such must be supported. In fact, according to the

Examiner's interpretation, Applicant should be able to add a new claim directed to a system that monitors for a period of slow activity (instead of for a period of no activity), and this claim would also be supported by the Provisional Patent Application.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the invention of Claim 1 is fully supported by U.S. Provisional Patent Application No. 60/217,800, which pre-dates the filing of Cho et al., and consequently that Cho et al. is not a properly cited reference. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections based on the combination Gerszberg et al. and Cho et al. should be withdrawn.

With respect to the rejections based on a combination of Gerszberg et al. and Pardo, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection on the basis that Pardo simply does not disclose, teach or suggest in any way the features that it is cited as disclosing. More specifically, the Examiner cites Pardo as disclosing "using a web page for phone service and VOIP." This, however, is simply not the case.

Pardo discloses a telephone docking station for a personal digital assistant provides a simple docking arrangement in conjunction with a basic telephone circuit that exploits all of the resident intelligence of a PDA in connection with the telephone circuit to extend the PDA's functionality to the telephone, while

extending the telephone's communications capability to the PDA. What this means essentially is that the telephone docking station allows for various aspects of the PDA (including Internet access) to be interfaced with a basic telephone circuit. (See, e.g., Column 3, Lines 6-10: "It would be advantageous to provide a simple docking arrangement in conjunction with a basic telephone circuit that could exploit all of the resident intelligence of a PDA in connection with such telephone circuit without having to duplicate such intelligence in the telephone itself."). This allows for several advantageous features to be realized, such as the receipt and transmission of email, the ability to access electronic networks, such as the Internet, e.g. to browse the World Wide Web, to allow dialing from the address book, from Web pages, and from email messages containing telephone numbers, and the provision of a convenient means to use various custom local area signaling services (CLASS) such as three-way calling, call forwarding caller-id blocking, and call return.

However, it must be recognized that what is being provided is an interface between the PDA and its Internet capabilities and the basic telephone circuit. Thus, while the Internet may be used to perform various services (such as send and receive email, receive web content, etc.), all calling is done using the basic telephone circuit. ("The output of the telephone circuit (and modem, discussed below) is coupled to a standard telephone connector 18, such as an RJ-11 (in the

United States). It will be appreciated that the telephone docking station herein described may provide any line connector as is appropriate for the locality in which the device is used.”) Thus, there is absolutely **no** disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Pardo of “using a web page for phone service and VOIP”, as is suggested by the Examiner, and consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that all rejections based on the combination Gerszberg et al. and Pardo should be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims, namely Claims 1-44, are patentable over the references of record, and earnestly solicits allowance of the same.

Respectfully submitted,

October 27, 2008

/Gene S. Winter/
Gene S. Winter, Registration No. 28,352
Todd M. Oberdick, Reg. No. 44,268
ST. ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC
986 Bedford Street
Stamford, Connecticut 06905-5619
(203) 324-6155
Attorneys for Applicant